DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 311 480 CS 506 710

AUTHOR Childers, Linda; Grunig, Larissa A.
TITLE Exploring Feminist Research in Journalism and Communication.
PUB DATE Aug 89
NOTE 75p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Association for Education in Journalism and Mass Communication (72nd, Washington, DC, August 10-13, 1989).
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Tests/Evaluation Instruments (160) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Communication (Thought Transfer); Communication Research; *Feminism; Higher Education; *Journalism; Mail Surveys; Research Design; Research Methodology; Research Problems
IDENTIFIERS *Feminist Scholarship; Journalism Research; Research Priorities; Research Styles; Research Trends

ABSTRACT

After outlining feminist theory (conceptualization and characteristics), a study examined attitudes toward issues having to do with feminist scholarship and the fields of journalism and communication, particularly assessing the validity of the conventional wisdom that women are advised against doing feminist research. The subjects were a purposive sample of 92 people in the field (consisting of 77 educators out of 150 surveyed and 15 graduate students out of 20 surveyed) representing scholars who had conducted feminist research and scholars who had not, educators and students, and males and females. Data were collected via a fractionation scale questionnaire, and some follow-up telephone interviews. The questionnaire explored attitudes about: (1) whether 17 listed issues should be an important aspect of the body of knowledge in journalism and mass communication, and whether these issues have actually achieved such prominence; (2) involvement with feminist research; (3) whether men can be feminist scholars; (4) whether attitudes toward feminist research have changed; and (5) the extent to which respondents believed having a feminist research agenda affects promotion and tenure decision. Data was also collected on demographic variables. Major findings showed some support among the sample of educators for the conventional wisdom that women are advised against doing feminist research, while indicating that women also have been encouraged to do feminist work; they also showed that among the sample of graduate students, advice about feminist scholarship was exclusively in the form of encouragement. (Five tables of data are included; 32 references and the feminist scholarship questionnaire are attached.) (SR)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED311480

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Linda Childers
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

EXPLORING FEMINIST RESEARCH IN JOURNALISM AND MASS COMMUNICATION

by

Linda Childers
College of Journalism
University of Maryland
College Park, MD 20742
(301/454-5540)

and

Larissa A. Grunig
Assistant Professor
College of Journalism
University of Maryland
College Park, MD 20742
(301/454-6936)

Paper submitted to the
Committee on the Status of Women in Journalism Education
Association for Education in Journalism and Mass Communication
April 1989

CS506710

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

INTRODUCTION[1]

Researchers have noted that women in academia are in far fewer positions of formal power than their male colleagues (Grunig, 1988a, p. 1). Rohter (1987) calculated the tenure rate for women at just below 50 percent, compared with almost 75 percent for men. According to him, figures gathered by the American Association of University Professors show that gender disparity transcends distinctions between universities regardless of size, source of funding, or prestige. Along the same lines, Gillespie (1988, p. 1) argued that

> all the hoopla over equal opportunity and affirmative action has created the illusion of a profound change in colleges and universities, a change that simply has not occurred.

The Irony of Women's Research and Empowerment

Female faculty who manage to crash the glass ceiling of promotion and tenure do so largely because of their research productivity (Grunig, 1988a, p. 1). Some scholars have argued, however, that the "patriarchal"[2] system operating in most universities precludes women from doing research on women's issues and thus exacerbates women's inability to empower

---

[1] The authors wish to acknowledge the Research Center in Public Communication at the College of Journalism, University of Maryland, for funding this research.

[2] Patriarchy in this context refers to Beck's ("Feminists Bring Broader Perspective," 1988) description of a university system whereby most disciplines have been approached traditionally from a monolithic point of view that is based on the experience of white males and omits other perspectives such as those of women and minorities.

themselves (Grunig, pp. 6-7).

Segal's (1988, p. 8) comments on women's situation in the academy illustrated this point well. He described how

> as the careers of this new generation [of women] unfolded, they [women] found that the intellectual agendas of universities had not changed with the times. Universities, like churches [sic] and military forces, have historically been male institutions. . .Women found that studying the role of women in poetry, in history, in architecture, or even in the family, continued to be regarded as unimportant by male colleagues. Even women whose work was not in feminist fields found that they were evaluated differently than their male peers. Not that the criteria were different. Rather the same criteria were applied differentially.

This situation of differential judgment with regard to women's research about women may not be a problem exclusively for females. That is, men also may lose status in the eyes of their colleagues if they undertake research endeavors that come too close to feminism. Meyer (1988, p. 107-108) told the story of an educational psychologist in the Netherlands whom she described as well-known and generally respected. She recounted that he, after being inspired by feminists,

> conducted important research that resulted in a book on the subtle influences in the classroom that discouraged girls from becoming too proficient in mathematics (Jungbluth, 1982). The book received much publicity. Later, at a conference, the researcher stated that since the publication of the book all of his contacts with mainstream social scientists had disapperared into thin air. He received no more invitations to lecture or write articles. He stated that from a content point of view the research was probably the best he had done, but from a career point of view it was definitely the worst.

Advising Women Against Doing Research About Women

Scholars' judging feminist work as unimportant might be one systemtic feature of patriarchy that contributes to women's blocked advancement. Another may be the conventional wisdom that women are advised against doing research about women and issues important to them (Grunig, 1988a, p. 7). Hall and Sandler (1983, p. 7) argued that senior faculty, most of whom are men (Sandler, 1984, p. 72), consider research interests that fall outside the mainstream of a discipline (such as feminist scholarship within communications) "risky." As a consequence, students interested in feminist research may lack the support and encouragement of those who could serve as powerful mentors (Grunig, 1988b; Hall & Sandler, 1983; Sandler & Hall, 1986).

Anecdotal evidence suggests that women fear being "branded" a feminist whose work will be devalued or ignored (Grunig, 1988a, p. 7). As a female undergraduate at the University of California at Los Angeles, who is also editor of the campus feminist newspaper, explained,

> Feminism is seen. . .as too angry or too militant for the 80's. Many of them [students] view people calling themselves feminists as 'man haters' and 'bra burners' ("Small but Active Feminist Groups Work to Meet Needs," 1986).

Another female student, who is president of the University of Kansas' Commission on the Status of Women, stated that

> when asked if a person is a feminist, I would say a majority of the time they'd say No. But when asked if they support women's rights--equal pay, equal work--the majority of the time they'll say Yes ("Small but Active Feminist Groups Work to Meet Needs," 1986).

The New Majority

At this point, we might argue against the propagation of a patriarchal worldview as the reigning one in academia on humanistic grounds. For scholars of journalism and mass communication, however, another issue is particularly relevant. Women outnumber men in the classroom and in some aspects of the field. For some, if not most, professors, teaching communications has come to mean teaching to a female majority.

But even as journalism and mass communication experience an influx of female students, men's presence on communications faculties continues to surpass women's (Sharp, Turk, Einsiedel, Schamber, & Hollenback, 1985, p. 61). Sharp et al. documented that in 1983 only about one in six faculty members was a woman, only 17 percent of these female faculty had reached the associate or full professor levels, and only a handful served as administrators.

With these figures in mind, we might wonder if a gap exists between the concerns of academics and the needs of students and practitioners.[3] This "gap" between traditional communications academe (if grounded predominately in the philosophies and methodologies of white males) and the new demography of the student body seems to imply that researchers might need new

---

[3] As Keohane (1986, p. 88) explained, women benefit from courses where scholarship on women is included because women can then "identify with the history and culture they are taught, rather than see it as something entirely without reference to them and their own lives."

avenues for producing more comprehensive knowledge. As Sudarkasa (1987, p. 43) stated:

> In a world where demographic shifts have already stood the concepts of majority and minority on their heads, it is no longer intellectually defensible to presume to discuss human endeavor and human interaction from the perspective of only one group. The understanding of cultural differences is enhanced when people from a variety of backgrounds can enjoin and inform the debates.

Keohane (1986) argued that today's mix of researchers needs new perspectives not just to reclaim a legacy of scholarship but, rather, to expand it. She (p. 88) explained that scholars do not have to make a choice between retaining "traditional intellectual authority" or falling "into an alphabet soup of pluralistic ideology, a mishmash of interest-group scholarship":

> The reality we confront is more complex, and vastly more exciting: a whole series of disciplines enriched and expanded by new scholarship, which enhances and deepens our understanding of the classics even as it opens perspectives hitherto closed to us.

We might argue, then, that as the classics can be enriched and expanded by new perspectives, so too might journalism and mass communication vis-a-vis feminist scholarship. First, however, we need to explore what we mean by the "feminist" perspective. Through this exploration, we seek to accomplish two goals. The first is acquainting communication scholars with feminist theory. Our second objective involves outlining and discussing the results of a mail survey that examined issues having to do with feminist scholarship and communications. Meeting these two goals requires a presentation of some length. However, in the discussion section at the end of this paper, we

succintly re-examine the key issues uncovered in the literature in light of our survey results.

CONCEPTUALIZATION

The term "feminism" means different things to many people. For this project, we wanted to reach as many perspectives as possible. We therefore adopted a broad conceptualization of feminist scholarship as research for or about women (or both) as opposed to research on women. We presented this explication assuming it was only one definition of feminist research among a number of equally rich interpretations.

The Problem of "Defining" Feminism

After receiving comments from others about the feminist perspective, we found ourselves questioning further how the feminist standpoint should be conceptualized. As one respondent wrote,

> Doesn't a feminist philosophy or perspective go far beyond "about or for women?" Feminist research needs to be for all--isn't that the essence of it? And similarly, research about women that is not written from the feminist stance of equality and cooperation is just that--research about women, and conceivably from a chauvinistic view.

Also commenting on our definition, one scholar argued that our definition of feminism may be problematic because it allows "someone doing hardcore quantitative research on how to sell laundry soap" to be "lumped in the same category as someone studying lesbian discourse in feminist periodicals."

These scholars' reference to "categories" of research and their implicit posing of dichotomies such as inequality/equality,

competition/cooperation, feminist/chauvinist, and quantitative/qualitative seemed to be examples of what feminist theory suggests we avoid--"a hierarchically arranged, closed system of binary oppositions" (Shotter & Logan, 1988, p. 75).

Code, Mullett, and Overall (1988, p. 7) stated that a recurring theme in feminism is "a resistance to dichotomous, dualistic, divisive modes of thinking." They (p. 7) explained that

> this resistance grows out of the conviction that such thinking imposes unnecessarily artificial distinctions upon experience, and often draws unwarranted evaluative conclusions from them.

Keeping these researchers' arguments in mind, we began to realize the difficulty of conceptualizing feminism in a way that upholds feminist theory, while at the same time, does not exclude new perspectives through paternalistic censorship of subject matter and methods (Gergen, 1988, xi). This process, whereby the creation of knowledge is dominated by experts in scientific fact making, is the essence of the patriarchal system that some feminists want to dismantle (Hubbard, 1988, p. 14).

Here we questioned whether as feminists struggle for their own voice, they must necessarily adopt the confining patterns of patriarchy that they criticize. Shotter and Logan (p. 82) described the irony of this situation.

> It is the demand feminist thinkers place upon themselves to adhere to disciplinary practices. . .that necessitates their reinscribing in their speech the very patterns of patriarchal relations they wish to undermine.

These assertions about feminists' own tendencies toward paternalism made us then wonder whether we could define feminism without, in the process of delineating its parameters, falling into the traditional (and patriarchal) mode of defining what knowledge is, how it is gathered, and who may do the gathering.

Given this precarious situation, we recognized that we must be cautious in drawing lines around what may be considered feminism and what may not. Might not the very act of standing back and trying to specify what is feminism according to this or that and conversely, what is not, epitomize the traditional mode of scholarship that for so long has defined women's concerns in the "not" category? We argue that the failure of feminists to remain ever-mindful of the academy's tendency toward developing knowledge "domains" (Shapere, 1977) that include "believers" and exclude dissenters leaves them open to replacing "patriarchy" with an equally oppressive, if not more cliquish, "feminarchy." We should keep this important realization in mind as we next explore the feminist point of view.

What Feminist Scholarship Is About

Interconnectedness of scientists, subjects, and facts

Gergen (1988, p. 94) explained that feminist thinkers reject certain aspects of the traditional empiricist methodology such as the independence of researcher, subject, and what comes to be considered "knowledge." Commenting on the relationship between the investigator and those being studied, Hubbard (1988, p. 9) recalled Freire's (1985, p. 51) recognition of the

"'indispensable unity' between subjectivity and objectivity in the act of knowing." She argued that recognizing the "unity between subject and object is what feminist methodology is all about." Feminism, that is, tries to recognize that "scientists, subjects, and 'facts' are all interconnected, involved in reciprocal influences, and subject to interpretation and linguistic constraints" (Gergen 1988, p. 94).

Gergen's and Hubbard's discussions bring to light the interconnectedness between scientists' gender and their relationship to subjects and facts. By recognizing this interconnectedness, communication scholars are challenged to formulate research programs that consider gender as a (if not the) primary category of societal organization (Dervin, 1987, p. 109). By failing to do so, scholars risk making untested assumptions about gender that "can produce research that is trivial, insupportable, politically naive, or damaging to women" (Rakow, 1986, p. 19).

Along similar lines, feminist theory views scientists as participants in their own research endeavors whereby subjects are given equal voice and stature (Gergen, 1988, p. 94). As Hubbard (1988, p. 1) asserted, feminists believe that scientists must try to understand their position in nature and in society as subjects and objects.

Feminism's call for elevating the status of "subjects" challenges communication researchers to devise methodologies that provide an egalitarian relationship between researcher and

subject. As communication scholar Brenda Dervin (1987, p. 109) explained, "feminist scholarship is. . .self-reflexive about the relationship and responsibility of the researcher to the researched." Thus, feminist scholarship in communications might establish a research environment in which the roles of "researcher" and "subject" are replaced by a "participant" role for all parties.

Decontextualization of the subject matter from the field

In their discussion of the contrasts between patriarchy and feminist theory, Shotter and Logan (1988) explored feminism's call for the contextualization of phenomena. They (p. 75) explained that feminist research involves "knowing from within a situation" and has "to do with relating to and participating with others in maintaining and changing patterns of human relation."

This contextualized kind of knowing, according to Shotter and Logan (p. 75), can be contrasted with traditional patriarchal patterns that lead to a "general" theoretical knowledge that can be possessed by individuals of their external world." Hubbard (1988, p. 10) also argued that feminists "insist that subjectivity and context cannot be stripped away," but, rather, "that they must be acknowledged if we want to understand nature and use the knowledge we gain without abusing it."

Hubbard went on to develop feminists' argument that people and their activities cannot be studied in a vacuum. She (p. 10) pointed out that "the kind of context stripping that is commonly called objectivity" is epitomized by sociobiologist E. O.

Wilson's (1975, p. 547) statement that scientists should

> consider man in the free spirit of natural history, as though we were zoologists from another planet completing a catalog of social species on earth.

Hubbard asserted that Wilson's comment illustrates a fallacy feminists try to recognize and overcome. She (1988, p. 10) suggested that there

> is no 'free spirit of natural history,' only a set of descriptions put forward by the mostly white, educated, Euro-American men who have been practicing a particular kind of science during the past two hundred years.

Similarly, communication scholar Lana Rakow (1986, p. 22-23) believed that scientists "construct a symbolic system which fits and explains their experiences." A program of feminist scholarship for communications would therefore reject "context-free" descriptions that claim to be objective. Instead, researchers would try to make explicit the assumptions (most importantly, the gendered assumptions) of the system within which they operate.

Code et al. (1988, p. 6) made this point well when they discussed how feminist theory tries to delineate the presuppositions that "shape both the structure and the content of any treatment of substantive issues." They contended that feminist philosophy recognizes that

> the alleged truths by which philosophers have been living and conducting their enquiries have the form they do at least in part because of the circumstances of their articulation.

Feminist scholarship within communications might go a long way toward debunking the notion of objective research (Grunig,

1988a, p. 3). In doing so, feminists in communications would make what Dervin (1988) considered their greatest contribution--turning everything they do into a problem. She (p. 113) explained that

> when you make everything into a problem, from how you ask the question, to how you collect the data, to how you make the observations, to how you draw conclusions, to whom you work with and how you work with them, in essence you are breaking apart the constraints and the traditional conceptions of what science and observation and scholarship are all about.

Value-laden theory and practice

Another challenge feminists pose to science's traditional paradigm is whether scientists can and should produce value-free research (Gergen, 1988). Gergen (p. 91) explained how feminist scholars prefer to recognize that "values are embedded in a supposedly value-free theoretical exposition." Sherwin (1988, p. 21) argued that while traditional philosophy is "deeply suspicious of explicit political concerns shaping one's intellectual exploration," feminists, on the other hand, "are suspicious of theoretic arguments that deny any political implications" (emphasis added).

Gergen (1988) called upon Crimshaw's 1986 work, Feminist Philosophers, to illustrate the value-laden aspects of science. In this piece, Crimshaw (p. 91) wrote,

> A theory like behaviorism, for example, implies that human beings and human behavior can be thought of as material to be 'modified,' and the term 'behavior modification' is often given to programmes which offer to apply behaviorist theory in order to effect changes in human behavior. Such programmes. . .imply a sharp distinction between 'controllers' and 'controlled' and are intrinsically and

profoundly anti-democratic.

Gergen (1988, p. 91-92) observed that sociologist Shulamit Reinharz (1985, p. 163) summarized the feminist position on value-free science when Reinharz pointed out that the

> feminist critique of social science supports the view that since interest-free knowledge is logically impossible, we should feel free to substitute explicit interests [sic] for implict ones. Feminism challenges us to articulate our values and, on the basis of these, to develop new theories and formulate new research practices.

Similarly, Hubbard (1988, p. 94) explained how, guided by feminist theory, "scientific endeavors would be treated as value-laden and would be formed with specific value orientations in mind."

When communication scholars accept feminism's argument that the creation of knowledge is value-laden, despite protestations to the contrary, they are free to adopt a research agenda that includes value-oriented concerns. By doing so, communication researchers might move toward theory that is better couched in personal experience. As Sherwin (1998, p. 21) explained, feminists believe this involvement "guards against the danger of ungrounded theory."

Feminism's call for replacing the implicit concerns of patriarchy with a free marketplace of explicit interests allows communication scholars to include in their theory building the voices of those previously silenced. In this sense, feminist scholarship in communications might show what a conceptual democracy really is like (Grunig, 1988a, p. 13).

Interdisciplinary approach

Pointing out feminists' regard for an interdisciplinary approach, Sherwin (1988, p. 20) noted that feminist scholars believe they are "constrained in their work by limits connected with the established frameworks of exisiting disciplines." Therefore, according to Sherwin (p. 6), feminists rely on "eclectic methodology, having its roots in various disciplines" and do not "restrict themselves entirely to any single disciplinary approach."

For communication researchers, then, feminist scholarship can at the very least provide "the same old research questions" with alternative methodological approaches (Dervin, 1987, p. 110). More importantly, though, a focus on eclectic methodology (a focus that contrasts sharply with patriarchy's reluctance to venture outside the "mainstream") may produce new and better (more comprehensive) research (Grunig, 1988a, p. 3). A step in this direction, feminists might argue, would be making the experiences of female students and practitioners central to journalism and mass communication's body of knowledge.

Communication research that showcases female experience, however, does not necessarily ignore the experience of males. As Dervin (1987, p. 113) argued, feminist scholarship has the potential to transform the communication discipline not by acting on its disciples, but, rather, by being available to be interacted with.

Activist posture

Comparing traditional philosophy and feminism, Sherwin (1988) examined the criteria of acceptability and criticism within these two fields. She noted that critical philosophers advance negative theses in order to disprove an analysis someone else has offered. Sherwin (p. 20) aruged that in doing so, the

> logic of argument is the most important feature of a philosophical position, far more important than the plausibility of the claims or the usefulness of the insight to other questions.

Feminist scholarship, Sherwin put forth, also recognizes the importance of logic; but feminists admit that they have political as well as intellectual aims when advancing an argument. She contended that feminists believe the effects of a theory, as well as its logic, are significant. Sherwin (p. 21) explained that,

> in other words, feminists view political effects as one measure of acceptability, though certainly not the only measure. Philosophers tend to be appalled by such frank admissions of bias.

Communication researchers might adopt feminism's activist stance as one way to empower themselves. Grunig (1988a) argued that if women want to gain power, they are obligated to be activists. She (p. 2) asserted that

> understanding how hierarchies of sex, color and class have structured both the academy and the knowledge developed there imposes a responsibility to act.

Grunig (p. 2) went on to point out that in the view of many feminists, "anything short of a 'revolution' is. . .'moral abdication.'" Communication scholars might benefit from this activist posture whereby researchers are allowed to set their own

agendas--agendas that can include concerns that do not necessarily jibe with what a patriarchal system designates "worthy of study" (p. 3).

Cooperative stance

Pointing out another contrast between traditional philosophy and feminist scholarship, Sherwin (p. 22) noted that philosophy makes "debating skill a chief criterion of success," and thus, promotes aggression and competitiveness. She (p. 21) explained that feminism, on the other hand, "holds onto an ideal of cooperative [sic], collective work". . .where "each contribution is related to the larger system of ideas, the larger project, and is not offered as a private theory then to bear one's name," but, rather, as a feminist view.

This feminist stance of cooperation could provide communication scholars with the first genuine effort to embody all of their experiences as scholars and practitioners (Grunig, 1988, p. 13). In a sense, then, feminist scholarship in communications might, for the first time, bring together the realities of the people of the entire discipline, men and women of all classes, sexualities, colors, and powers (p. 13).

RESEARCH OBJECTIVES

The above discussion of how feminism may be conceptualized opens up a number of intriguing research questions when coupled with the suggestion that feminist research may provide a fruitful avenue of scholarship within journalism and mass communication. From the body of knowledge in communication dealing with feminist

scholarship, several recent studies suggested worthwhile research objectives particularly relevant to this project.

The first of these is Spitzack and Carter's (1987) discussion in which they argue that female visibility and diversity in the academy may contribute to knowledge of women's communication, but the mere presence of women or their strength in numbers is not enough. They (p. 419) challenged researchers to not just conduct studies of women, but to "analyze embedded assumptions concerning objects of study, methods of data collection, and the questions guiding research." By doing so, they (p. 419) contended that portrayals of human communication will not be seen as right or wrong, but rather, reflective of "gendered and therefore political presumptions."

Similiarly, Dervin (1987) addressed what feminist scholarship can contribute to the field of communication. She (p. 112) called for inventing approaches that allow the "meanings" of women to be heard on their own terms. According to Dervin (p. 112), the important questions surrounding feminism and communication studies

> all focus on the fundamental concern of giving women voice so we may hear their reality: women's position in the patriarchal culture as produced and encoded in symbolic material; women's silence and how it was held in place and modified by other conditions; women's creativity as communicators in spite of that silence. . .

Keeping these researchers' suggestions in mind, we define the major objective of this study to be one of assessing the validity of the conventional wisdom that women are advised

against doing feminist research. Further, the suggestion that feminist scholarship makes a legitimate contribution to a research agenda for communications brings to light several interesting questions that can become ancillary objectives for this project. We can

*Determine the issues relevant to feminist research that scholars consider important.

*Assess the status of research on these issues relative to other issues in journalism and mass communication.

*Question whether men can be feminists.

*Examine whether men who do research on women are judged differently than women who do research on women. That is, are men hailed whereas women are railed?

*Gauge students' interest in feminist research.

*Gauge students' willingness to do feminist research.

*Explore the extent to which a feminist research agenda has contributed to or hindered scholars' tenure and promotion.

*Determine whether attitudes toward feminist research have changed and if so, for the better or worse.

Inherent in these research objectives is a rich array of comparisons of attitudes about feminist research across the dimensions of male/female and educator/student. Such a comparative perspective lets us explore the connections between observations, rather than merely observing, a goal Dervin (1987) presented as crucial to the development of feminist research within communications.

PROCEDURE

Sampling

The Association for Education in Journalism and Mass Communication was chosen as the population for this study because we judged it to most comprehensively represent the many voices of mass communication educators. That is, AEJMC represents educators with practitioner backgrounds as well as academicians who see themselves primarily as theoreticians and researchers.

Among AEJMC members, we sought to find both males and females, in disciplines as diverse as news/editorial and advertising, who could be expected to hold opinions, whether favorable or not, about the many ramifications of feminist scholarship and a feminist research agenda.

A purposive sample of 150 scholars, chosen from all academic ranks, was drawn to include:

*Female educators who have conducted feminist research.
*Female educators who have not.

*Male educators who have conducted feminist research.
*Male educators who have not.

*Female students who have conducted feminist research.
*Female students who have not.

*Male students who have conducted feminist research.
*Male students who have not.

The conference program from AEJMC's 1988 convention was used to identify educators who are involved in research that might be relevant to feminist scholarship. Male and female sample members were chosen from those who had participated in events sponsored or co-sponsored by the Committee on the Status of Women in

Journalism Education.

We could not ensure that the sample of graduate students included both males and females who either had conducted or had not conducted feminist research. Since we asked other educators to distribute the questionnaire to graduate students at their respective institutions, we could not determine who actually participated. We did, however, ask these educators to include students from all four groups if possible. As it turned out, no male students who had done feminist research were included.

A purposive, rather than random, sample was drawn so that we could include approximately the same number of scholars who have done feminist research as those who have not. Assuming that we might find differences in attitudes between these two groups, we needed to give each side equal voice. Given the dearth of feminist scholarship in communications, a random sample of AEJMC members would probably have shortchanged feminists.

Data-Gathering Method

A mail survey was conducted in the fall of 1988. After sending a questionnaire to 150 educators, we asked six scholars to distribute another questionnaire to 10 male and female M.A. and/or Ph.D. students in the program at their institution. The questionnaire filled out by graduate students was similar to the one sent to educators, but some questions were modified as necessary to make them appropriate for student respondents.

Members of the sample were sent a letter describing the nature of the project with the questionnaire. One follow-up

letter was sent to those sample members who did not respond within four weeks after the initial mailing.

Four questionnaires were returned unopened because the address was incorrect or the addressee was no longer at the institution because of moving or termination. Eight members of the sample did not complete the questionnaire but wrote a letter or a note explaining that they either did not want to, did not have time to, or were not qualified to participate in the study. The number of completed questionnaires received from educators was 77, bringing the final response rate to 51 percent.

The response from graduate students seems disappointing given only 15 questionnaires were returned, but an exact response rate could not be determined because we did not know how many students actually received a questionnaire. A number of factors might have contributed to this low number of responses such as a program's not having 10 graduate students, a problem we encountered in at least one case.

The questionnaire included an invitation for a follow-up telephone interview that involved further discussion of the issues raised by the questionnaire. Thirty-one educators and four graduate students indicated that they would be willing to respond to a telephone interview. All of these scholars were called at least once. Eighteen interviews were completed. This number was enough to uncover several themes that are relevant to this research. Results from these interviews are incorporated into the discussion at the end of this papar. We believe our

gathering of both quantitative data and anecdotal information presents another avenue by which fruitful comparisons across traditional demarcations can be explored.

Research Instrument

Our mail questionnaire employed a fractionation scale in an effort to overcome the problems associated with more traditional scales such as the Likert. In their discussion of measurement theory, Barnett, Hamlin, and Danowski (1982, p. 457) listed five properties of the real number system that are crucial to accurate and meaningful measurement:

(1) It is ordered, such that one is less than two is less than three, and so on,

(2) the distances between the intervals are equal,

(3) it has a true (absolute) zero point,

(4) the real number system is unbounded or infinite, and

(5) it is infinitely dense.

These communication researchers explained that "it is important to select a measurement system which meets these requirements because the tools of mathematics can be more fully applied to the gathered data." However, they argued that Likert scales, for example, fail to meet the latter three criteria and thus "severely restrict the instrument's precision of measure" (p. 457).

Barnett et al. (p. 458) presented the fractionation scale as a viable alternative to currently employed measurement procedures and listed the advantages of these scales.

> They allow for considerable variance. They are unbounded and are ideally suited to measure change over time, and thus, the process of communication. They are capable of fine discriminations among stimuli and they do not build error into the measurement process. Also, they have advantages in theory construction and allow for greater control over the measured phenomenon.

Barnett et al. (p. 456) further supported the use of fractionation scales when processes being measured vary widely. In this scenario, "mechanical administration of the same measures across different organizations" [people, in our case] "may fail to capture not only important variance among them, but crucial unique variance within many different organizations" [people]. Their contention seems especially strong when applied to the context of feminism, given its widely varying philosophies, conceptualizations, and methodologies.

Following Barnett et al.'s arguments for the use of fractionation scales, particularly in communication research, we judged this method of measurement to be especially appropriate for this research as well as superior to more commonly used procedures.

In our study, we presented sample members with a scale that anchors a score of 100 as the average for all journalism and mass communication educators and then asked them to evaluate themselves for all questions against this average. They could answer from zero (does not describe the respondent relative to the average educator) to as high as they wanted. For instance, a respondent's score of 600 for the statement "I am interested in feminist research" would indicate that he or she is six times

more interested in feminist research than the average journalism and mass communications educator.

Several respondents complained that the scale employed in our study was difficult to use and confusing. The majority of respondents, however, filled out the questionnaire with no problem; and of those who indicated confusion, most completed the questionnaire successfully.

We consider our selection of this scale warranted not only on the grounds of the measurement issues raised above but also because of lack of evidence that respondents' confusion seriously hindered their ability to respond. Our response rate is as high if not higher than the response rate of other mail surveys that have employed more traditional scales.

Barnett et al. (p. 457) agrued that it is only folk wisdom that holds most people cannot effectively understand or use sophisticated scales. We agree, especially given the education and academic experience of our sample.

The six-page questionnaire was divided into seven sections. The first section listed 17 issues that feminist scholars within communications might be concerned with. These issues were extrapolated from the literature about communications and feminism as well as a list of suggested topics for an upcoming conference showcasing feminist research (sponsored by the Women's Studies Program at the University of Maryland). Sample members were asked to indicate the extent to which they believe each issue should be an important aspect of the body of knowledge in

journalism and mass communication.

The next part of the questionnaire asked sample members to evaluate this list of issues again, but this time, indicate the extent to which respondents believed each issue had actually achieved prominence in journalism and mass communication relative to other issues.

Some respondents indicated confusion over a few of the feminist issues listed in the first and second sections of the questionnaire. This confusion was probably due to the particular wording of some items--wording that may be specific to feminist theory and thus, not familiar to all scholars.

We then included a section in the questionnaire that examined educators' and students' involvement in feminist research. Respondents indicated their level of interest in feminist scholarship as well as whether or not they had conducted, presented the results of, or published feminist research. Several statements gauged whether or not sample members had included feminist scholarship in the readings for their courses or in their lecture material. This section also included the items that had to do with being advised against or encouraged to do feminist research and whether respondents were advising students against or encouraging students to become involved in feminist pursuits. Finally, opinions about the risks of being "branded" a feminist were examined here.

The fourth part of the questionnaire involved exploring whether men can be feminist scholars and whether women make the

best feminist scholars. We also asked sample members to give us their opinions on whether or not females who do feminist research and judged differently than males. Respondents considered whether men and women gain or lose respect as a result of engaging in feminist research.

We next included a section that determined whether sample members thought attitudes toward feminist research have changed. Respondents who indicated that they felt attitudes have changed were asked to specify whether they believed these attitudes had changed for the better or for the worse for feminist scholars.

Another series of items explored the extent to which respondents believed having a feminist research agenda contributes to or hinders men's and women's chances for promotion and tenure. Here, we also asked respondents to indicate whether they believed they had benefitted from or been discriminated against because of their feminist endeavors.

The final section of the questionnaire contained statements having to do with demographic variables and scholars' status in the promotion and tenure process, involvement in professional associations, and publishing productivity.

We estimate the average length of time for completing the questionnaire to be about 25 minutes.

Analysis

All data were analyzed using the Univac system of the Computer Science Center at the University of Maryland, College

Park. The SPSS^{X} program was used for all analyses.

A preliminary scan of the data revealed that only a couple of respondents for several questions used numbers on the scale higher than those represented by three places to the left of the decimal point (numbers higher than 999). Thus, to make data entry less cumbersome, these responses were entered as 999.

Next, the data were found to be skewed for most variables beyond an acceptable level of +-1.00. To reduce the skew, the data were transformed by taking the square root of all values for each variable. For all but a few variables, this square root transformation was successful in decreasing skewness to a much smaller level. These transformed data were used in computing the correlations coefficients reported later.

The original skew of the variables for which the square root transformation did not prove helpful was less than +-1.00 to start with, so the data that correspond to these variables were used in their original form.

RESULTS

Educator Profile

Although an approximately equal number of men and women were included in the sample, more than twice as many women as men responded--53 and 24, respectively. The mean age of our respondents was 43. Younger respondents were overwhelmingly female; those over 53 tended to be male.

Just under one third (31 percent) of the respondents possessed a master's degree and over half (57 percent) a doctoral degree. Females had had more education than males. While an approximately equal number of men finished their formal education with a bachelor's or master's degree as those who had completed a Ph.D., more than twice as many women possessed a Ph.D. or even post-doctoral credentials as those who held a bachelor's or master's degree alone.

Most respondents were at the assistant professor level (44 percent), with associate professors making up 23 percent of the final sample and full professors 13 percent. Those respondents who were titled lecturer, instructor, adjunct, or part-time faculty comprised 14 percent. Men were equally distributed among the assistant and associate professor levels, while two and one half times as many women were assistant rather than associate professors. Of the 24 men who responded, six were full professors, while four of the 52 female respondents had reached the full professor level.

Of our respondents, 37.7 percent had been promoted in the last five years. Of those who had not, nine were men, and 20 were women.

The variety of specializations listed by respondents included skills coursework, journalism, public relations, advertising, broadcasting, law, theory, research methods, feminist scholarship, gender and women's issues, media and society, communication arts, mass communication, history,

international/cultural communication, and science communication. Some respondents indicated that they were generalists with no specialization. One man indicated that he specialized in feminist scholarship, while eight women listed feminist scholarship or gender and women's issues as their focal area.

Almost the same number of respondents were tenured (38 percent) as were untenured (39 percent). Twenty-two percent replied that they were not on a tenure track. Although more than one half of the male respondents were tenured, more than twice as many women were not tenured or not on a tenure track as women who had tenure.

Most respondents (43 percent) indicated that they attend professional association meetings two times a year, with 56 percent having served as an officer at least once within the last 10 years. Those attending more than four meetings a year tended to be women.

The number of times within the last five years that respondents presented papers, programs, or both to professional association meetings ranged from zero to 65. The average for all respondents was six. Of the 40 respondents who presented more than three papers, 34 were women.

The average number of articles, monographs, and/or book chapters published within the last five years by our respondents was six. Of the 35 respondents who have had more than three publications, 23 were women. This question, however, turned out to be ambiguous because some respondents interpreted it to

correspond to articles in refereed publications (as we had originally intended), while others thought it referred to articles published in newspapers, magazines, and so forth. Thus, the range of responses (zero to 20, with one person answering 650![4]) might be misleading.

Student Profile

Although we do not know how many male and female graduate students received the questionnaire, of the 15 who responded, 10 were female. The age of these students ranged from 22 to 36, with an average age of 28.

About as many graduate students were working on a doctoral degree as those who were engaged in a master's degree program. The majority of students were teaching assistants, although four women did not have an assistantship. One woman was a fellow.

Most of the graduate students listed their chosen area among one of the general fields of journalism, public relations, broadcasting, or advertising. Several listed more specific areas, such as mass communication theory.

Continuing in academia was most students' plan for their career, although almost as many women wanted to get a job in their professional field as those who wanted to pursue academics.

Attendance at professional association meetings was low among these students except for one woman, who reported she goes

---

[4] The accuracy of this response might be questionable. When entering the data, we assigned only two spaces for the response to this question, so this particular response was recoded to 99.

to meetings five times a year, and another woman who indicated that she attends professional association meetings 12 times a year.

The majority of graduate students had not served as an officer of a professional association in the last 10 years. Two males and one female, however, had served once; one woman had served as an officer twice in the last 10 years.

As for presenting papers and/or programs to professional associations, these graduate students had not been very active. Two males, however, had presented one paper and/or program within the last five years, while one female had presented two.

Looking at these students' publishing record, we found the males tended to be more productive. Only one woman had published one article, monograph, and/or book chapter in the last five years. In contrast, one male had three publications, another had four, and still another had 10.

Meeting Research Objectives

Keeping in mind the profiles of these respondents, we can turn now to examining each research objective in light of the data from these educators and graduate students. The first of our objectives is the core of this project--assessing the validity of the conventional wisdom that women are advised against doing research on women.

Women and advising

Looking first at the responses from our sample of educators, we found that although there was a significant positive

correlation between being female and being advised against doing feminist research, we also found a significant positive correlation between being female and being encouraged to do feminist research.

More specifically, we can see from Table 1 that being female correlates positively and signficantly with encouraging students and being encouraged by faculty, colleagues, and family members to do feminist research. At the same time, however, there is a significant positive correlation between being female and being advised by faculty, colleagues, and family members not do do feminist research.

Table 1
Correlations among educators between female sex and being advised against or encouraged to do feminist research

	Female sex
I have encouraged my students to do feminist research.	.3096**
I have advised students not to do feminist research.	-.0948
In my career, I was encouraged by faculty members to do feminist research.	.4114***
In my career, I was advised by faculty members not to do feminist research.	.3626**
In my career, I was encouraged by colleagues/ other students/peers to do feminist research.	.4042***
In my career, I was advised by colleagues/ other students/peers not to do feminist research.	.4102***
In my career, I was encouraged by family members to do feminist research.	.2030*
In my career, I was advised by family members not to do feminist research.	.2522*

* $p < .05$
** $p < .01$
*** $p < .001$

Moving now to our sample of graduate students, we found a different story. Not one female student reported that she had been advised by other students, peers, colleagues, faculty, or family members against doing feminist research. Four women indicated that they had been encouraged by other students, peers, and/or colleagues as well as faculty members to do feminist research. In addition, one woman had received encouragement from family members.

Importance of feminist issues

Our next objective was to determine the issues relevant to feminist research that scholars consider important. Table 2 shows us several issues that might be important to feminist scholars and the median, mean, and range of values that correspond to how much our sample of educators thought each issue should be an important aspect of the body of knowledge in journalism and mass communication. Table 3 shows us the evaluations of the graduate student sample.

We can see that both educators and students ranked highly the issues of representations of women in the media and sexual discrimination in salary. Educators evaluated as important the issues of masculine biases in epistemologies and methodologies, masculine/feminine language usage and differences, and feminism's impact on communication's body of knowledge. Graduate students attached similar salience to gender differences in organizational roles, women's opportunities in the academy, and leading women historical figures.

One issue that ranked low among educators and students was evolutionary stages of research about women. In addition, educators assigned a low ranking to new technology's effect on women. Graduate students did the same for legacies of gender in journalism and mass communication.

Table 2
Median, mean, and range of values
for educators' assessment of importance of
feminist issues to journalism and mass communication

(Scale 0-999)

	Median	Mean	Range
REPRESENTATIONS OF WOMEN IN THE MEDIA	150	204	0--999
Gender differences in organizational roles	150	184	25--400
Women's oppression in the academy	100	161	0--500
Women's opportunities in the academy	150	186	0--500
SEXUAL DISCRIMINATION IN SALARY	200	215	0--999
Feminization's impact on journalism and mass communication	150	196	0--600
EVOLUTIONARY STAGES OF RESEARCH ABOUT WOMEN	100	139	0--500
Leading women historical figures	130	170	0--500
Role of gender in the construction of science	125	171	0--500
Feminism as an agent for change	150	180	0--600
Legacies of gender in journalism and mass communication	150	174	0--600
MASCULINE BIASES IN EPISTEMOLOGIES AND METHODOLOGIES	200	216	0--999
MASCULINE/FEMININE LANGUAGE USAGE AND DIFFERENCES	150	215	0--999
Gender differences in management style	150	192	0--600
Inclusion of women's diversities in the discourses of the communication disciplines	100	169	0--999
NEW TECHNOLOGY'S EFFECT ON WOMEN	100	155	0--700
FEMINISM'S IMPACT ON COMMUNICATION'S BODY OF KNOWLEDGE	150	206	0--999

All caps and underline indicate the five issues receiving the highest mean score.
All caps indicates the two issues receiving the lowest mean score.

Table 3
Median, mean, and range of values
for graduate students' assessment of importance of
feminist issues to journalism and mass communication

(Scale 0-999)

	Median	Mean	Range
REPRESENTATIONS OF WOMEN IN THE MEDIA	200	207	100--500
GENDER DIFFERENCES IN ORGANIZATIONAL ROLES	200	180	25--300
Women's oppression in the academy	125	158	50--400
WOMEN'S OPPORTUNITIES IN THE ACADEMY	150	184	50--500
SEXUAL DISCRIMINATION IN SALARY	200	306	50--999
Feminization's impact on journalism and mass communication	100	145	0--400
EVOLUTIONARY STAGES OF RESEARCH ABOUT WOMEN	75	100	0--400
LEADING WOMEN HISTORICAL FIGURES	100	198	20--600
Role of gender in the construction of science	100	171	0--600
Feminism as an agent for change	100	138	0--400
LEGACIES OF GENDER IN JOURNALISM AND MASS COMMUNICATION	100	107	0--250
Masculine biases in epistemologies and methodologies	200	168	0--400
Masculine/feminine language usage and differences	100	120	50--250
Gender differences in management style	100	162	0--400
Inclusion of women's diversities in the discourses of the communication disciplines	125	167	50--400
New technology's effect on women	100	163	0--500
Feminism's impact on communication's body of knowledge	100	135	0--500

All caps and underline indicate the five issues receiving the highest mean score.
All caps indicates the two issues receiving the lowest mean score.

Status of feminist issues

Keeping in mind to what degree educators and graduate students believed various feminist issues should be an important part of communication's body of knowledge, we can next inspect how our scholars judged the extent to which these issues have achieved prominence in journalism and mass communication relative to other issues.

Tables 4 and 5 show strikingly lower values than the values reported in Tables 2 and 3. These differences point to a gap between educators' and graduate students' ranking of how much these issues should be important and their perceptions of how much these issues actually have achieved prominence relative to other issues in journalism and mass communication.

For our sample of educators, the most noticeable discrepancies between the importance of and status of issues fell to feminization's impact on journalism and mass communication, the role of gender in the construction of science, masculine biases in epistemologies and methodologies, masculine/feminine language usage and differences, and feminization's impact on communication's body of knowledge.

Among the graduate students, the widest gap between importance and status was displayed among the issues of women's opportunities in the academy, sexual discrimination in salary, leading women historical figures, the role of gender in the construction of science, and new technology's effect on women.

Table 4
Median, mean, and range of values
for educators' assessment of the status of
feminist issues in journalism and mass communication

(Scale 0-999)

	Median	Mean	Range
Representations of women in the media	100	126	0--400
Gender differences in organizational roles	75	102	5--400
Women's oppression in the academy	50	71	0--400
Women's opportunities in the academy	63	74	0--300
Sexual discrimination in salary	100	123	0--500
FEMINIZATION'S IMPACT ON JOURNALISM AND MASS COMMUNICATION	75	78	0--300
Evolutionary stages of research about women	50	57	0--300
Leading women historical figures	75	93	5--400
ROLE OF GENDER IN THE CONSTRUCTION OF SCIENCE	25	48	0--300
Feminism as an agent for change	50	64	0--400
Legacies of gender in journalism and mass communication	50	67	0--400
MASCULINE BIASES IN EPISTEMOLOGIES AND METHODOLOGIES	50	56	0--300
MASCULINE/FEMININE LANGUAGE USAGE AND DIFFERENCES	75	88	0--300
Gender differences in management style	90	99	0--400
Inclusion of women's diversities in the discourses of the communication disciplines	50	53	0--300
New technology's effect on women	50	56	0--400
FEMINIZATION'S IMPACT ON COMMUNICATION'S BODY OF KNOWLEDGE	50	55	0--200

All caps indicates the five issues displaying the largest discrepancy (computed by taking the difference between means) between importance of and status of the issue .

Table 5
Median, mean, and range of values
for graduate students' assessment of the status of
feminist issues in journalism and mass communication

(Scale 0-999)

	Median	Mean	Range
Representations of women in the media	75	109	50--300
Gender differences in organizational roles	88	112	10--400
Women's oppression in the academy	25	60	0--300
WOMEN'S OPPORTUNITIES IN THE ACADEMY	63	69	0--200
SEXUAL DISCRIMINATION IN SALARY	100	137	25--300
Feminization's impact on journalism and mass communication	75	80	0--200
Evolutionary stages of research about women	50	57	0--200
LEADING WOMEN HISTORICAL FIGURES	50	64	0--175
ROLE OF GENDER IN THE CONSTRUCTION OF SCIENCE	38	42	0--100
Feminism as an agent for change	63	70	0--200
Legacies of gender in journalism and mass communication	50	62	0--200
Masculine biases in epistemologies and methodologies	50	63	0--300
Masculine/feminine language usage and differences	88	84	0--200
Gender differences in management style	73	91	10--400
Inclusion of women's diversities in the discourses of the communication disciplines	50	66	0--200
NEW TECHNOLOGY'S EFFECT ON WOMEN	50	52	0--150
Feminism's impact on communication's body of knowledge	63	60	0--100

All caps indicates the five issues displaying the largest discrepancy (computed by taking the difference between means) between importance of and status of the issue.

Men as feminist scholars

Our next objective involved questioning whether men can be feminists. Responses from the sample of educators fell along a continuum with relatively high discrimination. On the low side, three women reported that the statement, "I believe men can be feminist scholars," did not describe them. On the high end were nine women and three men who thought this statement described them fourfold compared to the average. In between were 10 levels of response. We found, however, no significant relationships between sex and the responses for the statement that men can be feminist scholars.

Graduate students seemed slightly more likely than educators to believe men could be feminist scholars. All of the students reported that this statement described them at least somewhat, even if below how they thought the average student feels. One male student indicated this statement described him almost tenfold (remember that the few responses of 1,000 or higher were entered as 999).

We also looked at whether our sample members thought that women make the best feminist scholars. The modal response from educators for this question was 200, meaning that most of our respondents believed twice as much as average that women make the best feminist scholars. Importantly, though, the next most frequent response was zero, meaning that almost as many educators felt the statement, "I believe women make the best feminists scholars," did not describe them.

Examining this statement further, we found that female educators were more inclined than male educators to believe that women make the best feminist scholars. Only nine of the 22 men who responded to this question felt the statement about women making the best feminists described them more than average. Thirty-three of the 51 women who responded, however, felt this statement described them more than average. In addition, men's responses ranged only from zero to one male's response of 300, while responses from women varied from zero to six women at 300, eight at 400, one at 500, and two at 999.

For our sample of graduate students, the modal response was 100, meaning that most often these students thought the statement about women as the best feminist scholars described them about as much as average. Unlike our sample of educators, though, here we saw two out of five male graduate students positioned at the higher side of the scale with responses of 400 and 500. The former response registered stronger than any of those from female graduate students.

Evaluating male and female feminist scholars

We next sought to examine whether men who do research on women are judged differently than women who do research on women. We asked respondents to assess whether they thought men and women gain or lose respect by conducting feminist scholarship.

Looking first at the overall responses from our sample of educators, we found that fewer people thought men lose respect than those who thought men gain respect by doing feminist

research. The same held true for women engaging in feminist scholarship.

Opinions varied most widely on the question of whether women lose respect because of their feminist endeavors. Responses ranged from the modal response of zero to a response of 999. Between these extremes were eleven levels of response with only women positioned at the levels above 100, with the exception of one male who thought this statement described him twice as much as average.

Correlation coefficents suggested that women believe that female and male educators lose respect when they conduct feminist research. Being female was positively and significantly ($p < .01$) associated with believing that men lose respect ($r = .2897$) when they pursue feminist interests as well as believing that women lose respect ($r = .3393$) for doing the same.

On the question of men's gaining respect from conducting feminist research, here, too, we found an interesting range of responses. Both male and female educators were almost equally distributed above and below the average educator's response of 100, but women seemed more likely to respond that the statement about men's gaining respect from doing feminist research did not describe their beliefs at all. Of the 49 women responding to this question, 11 indicated this statment did not describe them while of the 22 men who responded, only two answered with a zero.

Female educators also seemed much less likely than male educators to find the statement, "I believe women gain respect

when they conduct feminist research," congruous with their beliefs. We found more than twice as many women who felt this statement described them less than average than those who felt more strongly than average about women's gaining respect. Men, however, were one and one half times more likely than average to feel this statement described them as they were to feel it did not.

Turning now to how our sample of graduate students judged men and women who do feminist research, we found the most variation in the responses to the statement about women's gaining respect. Of the four students who felt more positively than average toward this idea, three were women. And inspecting the responses from the statement about men's gaining respect, we again found women more likely than men to subscribe to the idea that men gain respect from doing feminist research.

With regard to men's losing respect, all but one female felt this statement described them less than the average. Examining the statement about women's losing respect, however, we found two males who believed three times the average that women lose respect when they conduct feminist research and one woman who believed this one and one half times.

Students' involvement in feminist research

We can next turn to our research objective of gauging graduate students' interest in feminist research. Beyond looking at their interests, however, we also wanted to investigate the sometimes-separate issue of students' willingness to engage in

feminist scholarship. Although the number of graduate students who participated in the study was small, the responses of these 15 students revealed some patterns that shed light on our research objectives.

Of the five students who responded that they were more interested in feminist scholarship than the average student, only one was a male. And, while he was only one and one fourth times more interested, we found one female whose interest was one and one half times more than average, one female who was twice as interested, and one who was five times as interested.

Only female respondents were conducting or had conducted feminist research. One woman appeared very active in that she was conducting or had conducted five times what she considered the average participation in feminist research among students. Two-thirds of the students, though, were not conducting or had not conducted any feminist scholarship at all. None of the students had presented or published the results of feminist research.

These figures might be interpreted relative to students' responses about the inclusion of feminist scholarship in their coursework's readings and lectures. All but three students indicated that feminist research, relative to other topics, is included less than average in lectures and readings. Most students responded that the statements about feminism's inclusion in their coursework did not describe their situation at all.

The feminist research agenda's effect on promotion and tenure

Looking next at educators' attitudes about whether having a feminist research agenda contributes to or hinders a scholar's chances for promotion and tenure, we found that our respondents were more likely to believe, although not markedly, that women are more prone to being held back while men are more likely to be helped by such an agenda.

The statement producing the most variation in responses was "I believe a feminist research agenda hinders a woman's chance for promotion and tenure." Although most respondents indicated that this statement did not describe them, responses went as high as 999.

The mean response for the statement about a feminist research agenda's negative effect on women was 112, implying that overall, our respondents felt slightly stronger than average about the hindering aspects of a woman's feminist agenda. Interestingly, though, the mean response was 98 for the statement about feminism's contributing to a woman's chance for promotion and tenure--not much lower than the mean for the statement about feminism's hindering effects. The mean responses for these statements when "man" was substitued for "woman" were much lower, 69 and 65, respectively.

Correlation coefficients between sex and the responses for the statements about a feminist agenda's effect on promotion and tenure showed women believed that doing feminist research is a hindrance to their academic career. Being female was positively

and significantly related to the belief about feminism's negative implications for women ($r = .3108$, $p < .01$) and men ($r = .2141$, $p < .05$). At the same time, being female was negatively and significantly associated with the statement that a feminist research agenda contributes to a woman's chance for promotion and tenure ($r = -.2976$, $p < .01$) and negatively associated with the same statement applied to feminism's positive effects on men's careers ($r = -.1970$, $p < .06$).

Singling out the 43 female and seven male educators who actually had conducted or were conducting feminist research, we found that these educators were more likely to believe they had benefitted from their work than been discriminated against because of it. Thirty-two women and six men indicated that they had enjoyed benefits associated with their feminist endeavors. Twenty-one females and two males, however, reported that they had faced discrimination.

All of the 12 educators who reported they had faced atypical discrimination were women. Two female educators who were very active in feminism believed they had faced discriminatory sanctions 10 times more than average. Nevertheless, the statement about benefitting from feminist research was more strongly associated with being female ($r = .4020$, $p < .001$) than the statement about being discriminated against ($r = .3218$, $p < .01$).

Changes in attitudes toward feminist research

Our final research objective was to determine whether attitudes toward feminist scholarship have changed and if so, for the better or worse. Looking first at the responses from educators to the statement, "I believe attitudes toward feminist scholarship have not changed," we found some disagreement among respondents. Although the modal response from educators was zero, indicating that this statement did not describe their beliefs, almost as many educators felt that this statement described them as well as it did the average educator.

Female educators were more likely than male educators to hold strong opinions about a lack of change in attitudes toward feminism. For example, only three men out of 22 responded that the statement about no change in attitudes described their beliefs better than average. However, 13 out of 47 women responded that this statement described them more than average.

Looking closer at this item, we found four females and one male who believed one and one half times more than average that attitudes toward feminist scholarship have not changed. One male and seven females believed this statement described them twofold. Finally, one woman felt this attitude described her beliefs four times more than average.

By the same token, though, women were more likely than men to believe that attitudes toward feminist research are changing. Whereas almost one half of the male educators indicated that this statement did not describe them at all, almost three fourths of

the female educators found this statement at least somewhat congruous with their beliefs. Sixteen women felt the statement about change in attitudes toward feminist research described them better than average.

Looking only at those educators who were active in feminist research, about as many believed strongly that attitudes have changed with regard to feminist research as those who believed attitudes have not changed. Those who are most active in feminist research, however, tended to skeptical about any change in attitudes.

We can examine next whether our sample of educators believed that attitudes toward feminist research have changed for the better or for the worse for feminist scholars. We found that, overall, our sample leaned more toward feeling that attitudes have changed for the better. More than one half (59.7 percent) of the educators indicated that the statement about attitudes changing for the worse did not describe them at all. A slightly larger percentage, 63.1 percent, felt that the statement about attitudes changing for the better described them at least somewhat.

Further inspecting the items about changes in attitudes, we discovered that 20 educators felt more strongly than average about attitudes changing for the better, whereas only five educators felt the statement about attitudes changing for the worse described them better than average.

Among those educators who held a strong opinion about the

direction of change in attitudes toward feminist research, most were women. Only female educators (seven out of 43) held an average or stronger than average opinion about attitudes changing for the worse. Twenty-four women and five out of 21 men, however, held average or stronger than average opinions about attitudes changing for the better.

Looking specifically at feminist researchers who expressed the opinion that attitudes have changed, more than twice as many of these educators believed attitudes have changed for the better than for the worse. Most of those very active in feminist research, however, remained conservative in their outlook toward feminism's acceptance.

We found that graduate students, in general, were less likely than educators to believe attitudes toward feminist research have changed. Six of the 15 students indicated that the statement about changing attitudes toward feminism did not describe their beliefs at all. Only one student found the statement about no change in attitudes incongruous with his or her beliefs. At the same time, four students indicated they believed twice the average that attitudes toward feminist research have not changed.

Looking specifically at how males and females from our sample of students responded to the statements about changes in attitudes toward feminist scholarship, we discovered that women were more likely than men to believe that attitudes toward feminist scholarship have not changed. All of the women who

responded to the statement about no change found it at least somewhat congruous with their beliefs. Furthermore, eight out of nine women responded at average or above average levels of agreement. Males, on the other hand, responded at average or below average levels, with one male indicating that the statement about no change in attitudes did not describe him at all.

Similarly, we found that females were less likely than males to accept the idea that "I believe attitudes toward feminist scholarship are changing." Five out of eight women who responded to this statement felt that it did not describe them at all whereas only one man out of five responded with a zero.

Of the students who believed attitudes toward feminist scholarship have changed, more felt that attitudes had changed for the better than for the worse. More specifically, only four students indicated that they believed at least somewhat that attitudes have changed for the worse (these responses were at or below average levels), whereas seven students believed attitudes have changed for the better (four reponses were at average or above average levels).

Although both men and women were more likely to believe that attitudes have changed for the better than for the worse for feminist scholars, females again seemed reluctant to agree that there has been a positive change. More specifically, three out of five male students believed attitudes have changed for the better, whereas six out of nine female students indicated that this statement did not describe them at all. Neither males nor

females felt strongly that attitudes have changed for the worse for feminist scholars.

DISCUSSION

The comments of educators and students gleaned from follow-up telephone interviews provided additional input for assessing the issues raised in this research. In an effort to highlight and expand upon the findings of our mail survey, we have included these comments in the following sections.

Women and Advising

Although our conclusions cannot be generalized to any larger sample of educators or graduate students, we found some support among our sample of educators for the conventional wisdom that women are advised against doing feminist research. As one woman told us, she had been advised against this type of scholarship. Furthermore, since she had published research about women, she had been "labelled" a feminist. This respondent (as well as one man) believed that there is no encouragement within journalism for women who want to do feminist research. She told us that women interested in feminism must become "renegades." According to her, much rhetoric says it is okay do feminist work, but it is still dangerous even though feminist pieces are published in refereed journals.

However, in contrast to some women's being advised against doing feminist research, our results indicated that women also have been encouraged to do feminist work. And importantly, among our sample of graduate students, advice about feminist

scholarship was exclusively in the form of encouragement. For example, one female graduate student told us that in her academic career, she has received a lot of encouragement to do feminist research. Moreover, she has been encouraged by male faculty members whom she considers feminists. Her communications department has strong feminists on its faculty; and there, she has seen no evidence of advice against feminist pursuits.

Similarly, a female educator mentioned that she never was discouraged from feminist endeavors. Further, she encourages her students to look into this line of scholarship. Another educator reported that in her academic career, she was encouraged by both men and women although she pointed out that she only sought those faculty members who would give her encouragement. Still another educator wrote, "I strongly approve of feminism and try to instill in my students the importance of combatting sexism."

Changes in Attitudes Toward Feminist Research

The overall tendency among our sample of educators was to believe that attitudes have changed for the better while rejecting the idea that attitudes have changed for the worse for feminist scholars. Those most active in feminist research, however, remain skeptical in their outlook toward feminism's increasing acceptance. As one female educator told us, attitudes might be changing for the better, but scholars dabbling in feminism still hear about the "dangers" inherent in engaging in feminist pursuits.

Women in our sample were more likely than men to hold a

strong opinion about changes in attitudes of either direction. Only female educators held an average or stronger than average opinion about attitudes changing for the worse. This sentiment on the part of female scholars could stem from unfounded worrying about feminism's negative sanctions or from increased sensitivity resulting from first-hand or secondary knowledge of discrimination against feminists.

Among our sample of graduate students, we found that, again, women were more likely than men to estimate conservatively any positive change in attitudes toward feminism. Overall, though, these students were more likely to believe that attitudes toward feminist research have changed for the better than they were to believe attitudes have grown harsher toward feminists.

One female graduate student, who has been encouraged to examine media images from a feminist perspective, expressed an optimistic outlook toward feminism's acceptance and integration within the university system. She told us that attitudes are changing for the better, and feminists now enjoy more support and validation than in the past. She cited her university's Center for Women's Studies as one example of feminism's increasing visibility and stature.

The Feminist Research Agenda's Effect on Promotion and Tenure

With regard to feminism's effects on scholars' promotion and tenure, the responses from our sample of educators presented a variety of opinions. Overall, our respondents felt that women

are hurt more by having a feminist research agenda than men are. As one female educator told us, her gut reaction was that adopting feminist interests hinders women. She was not sure about feminism's effects on men.

This educator explained that pursuing feminist concerns hurts women because feminism is not considered legitimate. She believed that although universities are usually thought of as liberal and open-minded, they are actually conservative institutions that are resistant to change. And since feminism is new and different, resistance to the movement crops up within universities. Furthermore, she believed that women who engage in feminist research are cast as "chip-on-the-shoulder" researchers who are out to prove a point. By not upholding science's ideal of "objectivity," feminists stand to face negative sanctions.

Given our scholars' belief that feminism can hinder a woman's chance for promotion and tenure, it was intriguing to find that our sample of educators felt strongly about the beneficial effects that accrue to women who engage in feminist endeavors. As one female educator put it, "Sometimes it hurts; sometimes it helps." She explained that doing feminist research brings advantages to women when it gives women a sense of solidarity.

Another female educator brought up the point that feminist research's harmful or beneficial effects are situational. As one tenured female professor stated,

> Fortunately, I don't think I've been hurt because of my research on feminist issues. I've managed to publish in mainline places so I've had refereed publications. To some degree, my colleagues (male) have aided me. At least they have left me alone to do my own work. I've heard of women at other schools being afraid to do feminist work, but I'm not.

A university "culture" that is enlighted about women's issues might explain why this female educator felt that "feminism had come a long way and has a bright future."

Overall, though, women were less likely to believe in the benefits to the promotion and tenure process brought by having a feminist research agenda than they were to believe in feminism's negative effects. These women's perceptions are particularly interesting given that among our sample of educators, being female was more strongly associated with benefitting from feminist research than being discriminated against because of it. (Both associations were positive.) Perhaps, these women's memories of past injustices still shape their perceptions. One female educator recalled how in the past, women were denied tenure as a result of their feminist concerns. Of course, some scholars argue that this discrimination persists.

Men as Feminist Scholars

The variety of responses to the question of whether men can be feminists indicates an area that needs to be examined further. Our data showed that female educators were less likely to believe that men could be feminists and more likely to believe that women make the best feminists.

One male respondent, commenting on the question of men as

feminists, stated that his opinion depended on the definition of "feminism." He argued that if being a feminist means that you believe in full equality for men and women in all aspects of society, then yes, he is a feminist. This educator challenged critics of feminism who argue that women working in this capacity necessarily have a chip on their shoulder that prevents them from being "objective." He pointed out that, to the contrary, women as feminists might have ideal capabilities, as blacks scholars who do research about minorities might.

One female respondent told us that she thought men, at least in college-level English, were getting into feminism because it was "kind of chic." The difference here, though, was that these men are not politicizing feminist issues. For the most part, this educator believed most men look upon feminist endeavors with "polite interest" and engage in "blaming the victim."

Arguing against the exclusion of anyone from research that purports to be concerned with issues of oppression, one female educator stated that

> women are just one of many oppressed groups. Furthermore, I don't believe research is good or bad, moral or immoral, just because it privileges women.

Evaluating Male and Female Feminist Scholars

We found fewer people who thought men or women lose respect because they choose to engage in feminist scholarship than those who thought men and women do not lose respect. Opinions appeared to be the strongest on the question of whether women lose respect. Interestingly, we found that women believe that

scholars of either sex lose respect when they conduct feminist research.

The finding that women are more likely than men to believe scholars lose respect and less likely to believe that scholars gain respect could stem from two sources. On the one hand, women could be overestimating the negative effects of having a feminist research agenda. One female educator, who has done research on gender issues, told us that she felt she might be a little "paranoid" about women's being discriminated against because their research interests do not jibe with those of men.

Or, again, women may just be more sensitive to discrimination because they have had first-hand experience with it or have known other women who have. For example, a female scholar told us that she was completely convinced that a colleague's denial of tenure was due specifically to her research interests--interests that diverged from those of the strong "old boy network" that was in place at this colleague's institution.

The impressions we got from our sample of graduate students about scholars' losing or gaining respect as a result of engaging in feminist research formed a slightly different picture. Here, female students were more likely than male students to believe that both men and women can bolster their status by doing feminist research. Some male students, on the other hand, held strong opinions about the loss of respect women encounter because of feminist pursuits.

Since all but one student who indicated interest in feminist

research were women, these responses about losing or gaining respect might indicate several things. Perhaps female graduate students who conduct feminist research are tied into the benefits that have come because of increasing acceptance of feminism, while their male colleagues hold onto traditional sterotypes of the branded feminist. Or, it may be that these female students, most of whom probably are just starting their careers and have not yet met any resistance, are still idealistic about being able to pursue their chosen interests. Male students, in contrast, may know first hand or believe that there has been little change in patriarchy's evaluation of feminism.

Importance and Status of Feminist Issues

Our analysis uncovered several aspects of feminism that scholars believed should be an important part of the body of knowledge in journalism and mass communication. For educators these issues were representations of women in the media, sexual discrimination in salary, masculine biases in epistemologies and methodologies, masculine/feminine language usage and differences, and feminism's impact on communication's body of knowledge. Graduate students attached similar importance to representations of women in the media, gender differences in organizational roles, women's opportunities in the academy, sexual discrimination in salary, and leading women historical figures.

Significantly, though, both educators and students indicated a fairly large discrepancy between the importance of some feminist issues and the extent to which these issues relative to

other issues have been addressed in communication's literature. This discrepancy seems to imply one of two things. The gap may suggest that feminist concerns stand at the fore of research issues that are emerging as important topics to be addressed. And, with time, their significance will be obvious in terms of how much attention they have received in mainstream communication publications. Or, the discrepancy may mean that although some scholars consider feminist issues an important part of communication theory, these scholars are holding back or have been held back from pursuing feminist interests.

We believe that both sides of this argument have contributed to this situation of scholars' ranking the importance of feminist issues higher than the representation of these issues in communication's body of knowledge. Arguing for feminism as an upcoming research arena, one female educator explained that although some feminist work was disparaged in the past, feminism's evolution has been going for about 10 years. She believed that feminist work is proving itself and becoming more refined. She pointed out that graduate students are involved in sophisticated topics and theories within feminism. Furthermore, she believed that AEJMC was becoming educated with regard to feminism's goals.

Looking at another position, though, one female educator asserted that prejudice against women still exists on university campuses, even though the current climate suggests discrimination has disappeared. She explained that men hold most

administrative positions in the university, causing "structural inequality." That is, the university's power structure is made up of men, who, however unconsciously, do not really concern themselves with women's issues. According to this educator, women in academia have enjoyed superficial improvements, but further improvements come face-to-face with a power structure that, for the most part, excludes women. Another female educator, who does research about the sexist portrayal of women in advertising, also discussed the problem of too few women in positions of power. She bemoaned the lack of female researchers, contending that "men can't see the problems."

Along similar lines, one female scholar told us that although feminism has enjoyed some progress, few men have come to grips with feminist issues. Another female educator felt that men resisted accepting some of the information produced as a result of researchers' investigating women's concerns.

Student's Involvement in Feminist Research

Charting the involvement of these graduate students in feminist scholarship, we found that most of these students had not or were not conducting feminist research. Only one male indicated that he was more interested in feminism than the average student might be. Several women, however, expressed strong interest in feminist scholarship even though none had presented or published the results of feminist research. Interestingly though, a female educator told us that although few journalism and mass communication students are pursuing feminism,

students from other disciplines are approaching feminist topics that are relelvant to communication.

Most of the graduate students in our sample described their course readings and the content of lectures as completely devoid of feminist material. Of course, feminist work might not be appropriate for all courses, as one female educator argued; but its almost blanket exclusion from these students' academic experience may be indicative of the gap between students' needs and academics' concerns that we referred to earlier.

One female graduate student told us that she believed most communication students "are not even aware" of what feminism is all about. As a female educator echoed, among her colleagues, ignorance about feminism is the norm. She stated that her peers think research on sex differneces is all there is to feminist scholarship, or worse yet, that research having to do with sex differences is enough.

CONCLUSION

The observations of this student and educator bring us to what might be the first step in eradicating the situation that brought this research project about--a patriarchal system that may devalue research about women and promote advice about avoiding feminist scholarship. This step involves raising educators' and students' awareness levels with regard to feminist research. But, as Grunig (1988a, p. 17) argued, "small scale gains in gender conciousness scarcely begin to address women's concerns for survival--much less success in academia." She

called for a restructuring of the university that

> requires a commitment to channel women's frustration at their powerlessness into the energy necessary for research productivity, in particular. A strong program of research will help ensure any women's ascension into a position of power and influence.

The empowerment of female communication educators and practitioners follows the legitimization of feminist research (Grunig, 1988a, p. 15). Communication scholars can begin this legitimization by recognizing the importance of supporting students and colleagues who explore new perspectives, such as feminism, rather than advising them against doing so. Encouragingly, the research reported here seems to indicate that this support already exists to some degree. Educators should now expand upon this progress. One obvious way to do so is to include feminist scholarship in course readings and lectures, a practice that this research found lacking.

Since pressure is building within communications to attend to the concerns of women and minorities [the newest standard of the Accrediting Council for Education in Journalism and Mass Communication calls for this attention], both male and female communication scholars stand to gain from a credible body of knowledge that addresses these concerns. Feminist research within communications can be the architecture for this body of knowledge.

And if, indeed, our goal is to build a strong program of feminist scholarship within communications, we believe this project suggested several themes that should top our research

agenda. Perhaps the most intriguing is the notion of university "culture" and its relationship to feminism's acceptance or rejection. Who sets the tone for the university's climate? Which presuppositions about feminism are in place? How is this worldview reflected in the norms of colleges and departments?

Rossiter (1982, p. 216) contended that historically, the heart of partiarchal culture in the university has been the concept of "prestige," whereby one's assessment of the quality of a scholar's work was linked more to the scholar's gender than his or her actual talents.

> Gender was such an overriding consideration that once it had entered the calculation, university faculties showed considerable ingenuity in institutionalizing women's presumed inferiority into separate programs and roles that allowed them to 'do science' but that guaranteed that whatever the quality of their work, its value would be diminished and their share in a career's normal recognition and glory withheld.

Rossiter (p. 194) went on to argue that the elitist and sexist philosophy of restricting opportunities to a few favored men has been held in place by academic practices such as the tenure track, antinepotism rules, salary scales, and the systematic channeling of women into separate, less prestigious parts of the university (such as schools of home economics).

Feminist scholarship within communications should explore how these practices and others contribute to a university climate hostile to feminism. We have begun this exploration here by assessing whether women are advised against doing feminist research. This advice is just one practice of a university

system that "feminism promises to revitalize and improve" (Namenwirth, 1888, p. 38). As Namenwirth (p. 38) pointed out,

> feminist reformers have revitalized and enriched our institutions again and again in history, each time profoundly affecting conditions for both women and men.

She (p. 38) went on to charge that patriarchy "needs a coronary bypass, and feminism is providing it."

References

Barnett, G. A., Hamlin, D. M., & Danowski, J. A. (1982). The use of fractionation scales for communication audits. In M. Burgoon (Ed.), Communication Yearbook 5 (pp. 455-471). New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction.

Code, L., Mullett, S., & Overall, C. (1988). Editor's introduction. In L. Code, S. Mullett, & C. Overall (Eds.), Feminist prespectives. Philosophical essays on method and morals (pp. 3-10). Toronto: University of Toronto.

Crimshaw, J. (1986). Feminist philosophers: Women's perspectives on philosophical traditions. Brighton, England: Wheatsheaf.

Dervin, B. (1987, Autumn). The potential contribution of feminist scholarship to the field of communication. Journal of Communication, 37, 107-120.

Feminists to bring broader perspective to disciplines. (1988, Month). Outlook, p. 2.

Freire, P. (1985). The politics of education. South Hadley, MA: Bergin and Garvey.

Gergen, M. M. (1988). Toward a feminist metatheory and methodology in the social sciences. In M. M. Gergen (Ed.), Feminist thought and the structure of knowledge (pp. 87-104). New York: New York University.

Gillespie, P. P. (1988, January). 1987 presidential address. Campus stories, or the cat beyond the canvas. Spectra, pp. 3-4.

Greene, E. (1986, April 23). Inside a men's discussion group at Haverford: 'How it feels to be male.' The Chronicle of Higher Education, p. 32.

Grunig, L. A. (1988a, July). Legitimizing a feminist research agenda for journalism and mass communication. Paper presented to the Committee on the Status of Women, Association for Education in Journalism and Mass Communications, Portland, OR.

Grunig, L. A. (1988b, August). Journalism students and the glass ceiling in academia: Problems and progress. Chapter submitted to A Gender perspective on Issues in Mass Communication.

Hall, R. M., & Sandler, B. R. (1983). Academic mentoring for women students and faculty: A new look at an old way to get ahead. Washington, D.C.: Project on the Status and Education of Women.

Hubbard, R. (1988). Some thoughts on the masculinity of the natural sciences. In M. M. Gergen (Ed.), Feminist thought and the structure of knowledge (pp. 1-15). New York: New York University.

Jungbluth, P. L. (1982). Docenten over onderwijs aan meisjes: Positieve discriminatie met een dubbele bodem (Teachers on educating girls: Positive discrimination with a false bottom). Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Instituut voor Toegepaste Sociologie, Nijmegen.

Keohane, N. O. (1986, April 2). Our mission should not be merely to reclaim a legacy of scholarship--we must exapnd it. The Chronicle of Higher Education, p. 88.

Meyer, J. (1988). Feminist thought and social psychology. In M. M. Gergen (Ed.)., Feminist thought and the structure of knowledge (pp. 105-123). New York: New York University.

Namenwirth, M. (1988). Science seen through a feminist prism. In R. Bleier (Ed.)., Feminist approaches to science (pp. 18-41). New York: Pergamon.

Rakow, L. F. (1986). Rethinking gender research in communication. Journal of Communication, Autumn, 11-26.

Reinharz, S. (1985). Feminist distrust. Problems of context and content in sociological work. In D. Berg & K. Smith (Eds.), Exploring clinical methods for social research. New York: Wiley.

Rohter, L. (1987, Jan. 4). Women gain degrees, but not tenure. New York Times, E9.

Rossiter, M. W. (1982). Women scientists in America: Struggles and Strategies to 1940. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University.

Sandler, B. R. (1984, February 29). The quiet revolution on campus: How sex discrimination has changed. Chronicle of Higher Education, p. 72.

Sandler, B. R. (1986). The campus climate revisited: Chilly for women faculty, administrators, and graduate students. Washington, D.C.: Project on the Status and Education of Women.

Segal, D. R. (1988, April 4). Feedback from Readers on the Status of UMCP Women [Letter to the editor]. Outlook, p. #.

Shapere, D. (1977). Scientific theories and their domains. In F. Suppe (Ed.), The structure of scientific theories (2nd ed.) (pp. 518-565). Urbana: University of Illinois.

Sharp, N. W., Turk, J. V., Einsiedel, E. F., Schamber, L., & Hollenback, S. (1985). Faculty women in journalism and mass communications: Problems and progress. Syracuse, NY: Gannett Foundation.

Sherwin, S. (1988). Philosophical methodology and feminist methodology: Are they compatible? In L. Code, S. Mullett, & C. Overall (Eds.), Feminist prespectives. Philosophical

essays on method and morals (pp. 13-28). Toronto: University of Toronto.

Shotter, J., & Logan, J. (1988). The pervasiveness of patriarchy: On finding a different voice. In M. M. Gergen (Ed.), Feminist thought and the structure of knowledge (pp. 69-86). New York: New York University.

Small but active feminist groups work to meet campus women's basic needs. (1986, April 23). The Chronicle of Higher Education, pp. 31-33.

Spitzack, C., & Carter, K. (1987). Women in communication studies: A typology for revision. The Quarterly Journal of Speech, 73(4), 401-423.

Sudarkasa, N. (1987, February 25). Racial and cultural diversity is a key part of the pursuit of excellence in the university. The Chronicle of Higher Education, pp. 42-43.

Wilson, E. O. (1975). Sociobiology: The new synthesis. Cambridge: Harvard University.

University of Maryland
College of Journalism
Feminist Scholarship Questionnaire

The first series of items is a list of issues that feminist communication scholars might be concerned with. Using the open-ended scale below, please choose any number from zero to as high as you wish that describes the extent to which you believe each issue should be an important aspect of the body of knowledge in journalism and mass communication. On this scale, 100 is the average level of importance to all journalism and mass communication graduate students on all the items. (It is not necessary for you to give precise answers to these questions. Your best estimate or even your best guess will do). Write the number you select in the blank by the item.

0....25....50....75....100....150....200....300....400....?				
Does not describe	Half the average	Average	Twice the average	As high you want

_____Representations of women in the media

_____Gender differences in organizational roles

_____Women's oppression in the academy

_____Women's opportunities in the academy

_____Sexual discrimination in salary

_____Feminization's impact on journalism and mass communication

_____Evolutionary stages of research about women

_____Leading women historical figures

_____Role of gender in the construction of science

_____Feminism as an agent for change

_____Legacies of gender in journalism and mass communication

_____Masculine biases in epistemologies and methodologies

_____Masculine/feminine language usage and differences

_____Gender differences in management style

_____Inclusion of women's diversities in the discourses of the communication disciplines

_____New technology's effect on women

_____Feminism's impact on communication's body of knowledge

The next series of items asks you to assess the status of research on each of the issues listed above. Using the same open-ended scale, please choose a number that describes the extent to which you believe each issue has achieved prominence in journalism and mass communications relative to other issues. Remember that 100 is the average score for all journalism and mass communication graduate students on all issues.

0....25....50....75....100....150....200....300....400....?				
Does not describe	Half the average	Average	Twice the average	As high you want

_____Representations of women in the media

_____Gender differences in organizational roles

_____Women's oppression in the academy

_____Women's opportunities in the academy

_____Sexual discrimination in salary

_____Feminization's impact on journalism and mass communication

_____Evolutionary stages of research about women

_____Leading women historical figures

_____Role of gender in the construction of science

_____Feminism as an agent for change

_____Legacies of gender in journalism and mass communication

_____Masculine biases in epistemologies and methodologies

_____Masculine/feminine language usage and differences

_____Gender differences in management style

_____Inclusion of women's diversities in the discourses of the communication disciplines

_____New technology's effect on women

_____Feminism's impact on communication's body of knowledge

The next series of items looks at educators' and students' involvement in feminist research. Continue using the scale above where 100 is the average score for all journalism and mass communication graduate students on all items.

0....25....50....75....100....150....200....300....400....?				
Does not describe	Half the average	Average	Twice the average	As high you want

_____I am interested in feminist scholarship.

_____I have conducted or am conducting feminist research.

_____I have presented the results of feminist research at professional meetings.

_____I have published feminist research.

_____Feminist research is included in the reading for the courses I take.

_____Feminist research is covered in course lectures.

_____I have encouraged other students/peers/colleagues to do feminist research.

_____I have advised other students/peers/colleagues not to do feminist research.

_____In my coursework, I have been encouraged by faculty members to do feminist research.

_____In my coursework, I have been advised by faculty members not to do feminist research.

_____I have been encouraged by family members to do feminist research.

_____I have been advised by family members not to do feminist research.

_____If a feminist scholar asked me to collaborate with him or her, I would consider it.

_____Being "branded" a feminist is something to be avoided.

_____I do not do feminist scholarship because I do not want to risk being "branded."

_____If I were a faculty member and a student of mine wanted to do feminist research, I would be willing to direct him or her.

The next series of items explores the possible relationship between scholars' gender and involvement/interest in feminist research. Remember 100 is the average score for all journalism and mass communication graduate students on all items.

0....25....50....75....100....150....200....300....400....?				
Does not describe	Half the average	Average	Twice the average	As high you want

_____I believe men can be feminist scholars.

_____I believe women make the best feminist scholars.

_____I believe men gain respect when they conduct feminist scholarship.

_____I believe men lose respect when they conduct feminist scholarship.

_____I believe women gain respect when they conduct feminist scholarship.

_____I believe women lose respect when they conduct feminist scholarship.

The next series of items assesses students' perceptions of attitudes about feminist scholarship. Continue using the scale above where 100 is the average score for all journalism and mass communication graduate students on all of the items.

0....25....50....75....100....150....200....300....400....?				
Does not describe	Half the average	Average	Twice the average	As high you want

_____I believe attitudes about feminist scholarship have not changed.

If you answered affirmatively to the above item, please put a zero (does not describe) in the blank for the next three items.

_____I believe attitudes about feminist scholarship are changing.

_____I believe attitudes about feminist scholarship have changed for the better for feminist scholars.

_____I believe attitudes about feminist scholarship have changed for the worse for feminist scholars.

The last series of items investigates the feminist research agenda and its possible effect on scholars' promotion and tenure. Remember 100 is the average score for all journalism and mass communication graduate students on all items.

0....25....50....75....100....150....200....300....400....?				
Does not describe	Half the average	Average for all items	Twice the average	As high you want

_____I believe a feminist research agenda contributes to a woman's chance for promotion and tenure.

_____I believe a feminist research agenda hinders a woman's chance for promotion and tenure.

_____I believe a feminist research agenda contributes to a man's chance for promotion and tenure.

_____I believe a feminist research agenda hinders a man's chance for promotion and tenure.

_____I believe I have benefitted from doing feminist research.

_____I believe I have been discriminated against because I have done feminist research.

The final section contains questions regarding demographic variables. Please either place a check on the blank before the correct answer or, where indicated, fill in the correct answer on the blank provided.

I am

_____1 male. _____2 female.

My age is _____.

My highest level of education in any field is a

_____1 bachelor's degree. _____3 doctoral degree.

_____2 master's degree. _____4 post doc.

My title is

_____1 teaching assistant.

_____2 research assistant.

_____3 other.

My specialization is _____.

My plans after graduation are to

_____1 continue in academia.

_____2 get a job in my field.

_____3 get a job outside my field.

_____4 other (please specify)._____

I attend my professional association meetings about _____times a year.

I have served as an officer of a professional association _____times in the last 10 years.

I have presented papers/programs to a professional association _____times in the last 5 years.

I have published approximately_____articles/monographs/book chapters/etc. in the last five years.

Thank you for your cooperation.

If you are willing to be contacted to discuss any of the items on the questionnaire or any of your experiences involving feminist research, please provide your name and phone number below. If you wish, you can remain anonymous.

Name_____

Phone number_____